

REMARKS

At the outset, appreciation is expressed to Examiner Trinh for his careful examination of this application. However, favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Independent Claims 47, 52, 54, 55 and 56 each remain rejected as being unpatentable based on the disclosures in U.S. Patent No. 5,598,032, hereinafter Fidalgo, and U.S. Patent No. 5,640,306, hereinafter Gaumet.

The method recited in amended Claims 47 and 55 includes producing, on a face of a support sheet, at least two turns of the antenna and a pair of ends or pads in a layout in which no turns of the antenna are disposed between the pair of ends or pads. while the method recited in amended Claim 52 includes producing, on a support sheet, the antenna including at least two turns and a conductive element electrically insulated from the turns and crossing over or under at least one turn of the at least two turns in a layout in which no turns of the antenna are disposed between the two ends. Additionally, the method recited in amended Claim 54 includes producing, on a face of a support sheet, at least two turns of the antenna with a pair of ends or pads for electrically connecting the chip in a layout in which no turns of the antenna are disposed between the pair of ends or pads. Moreover, the method recited in amended Claim 56 includes producing, on a support sheet, at least two turns of the antenna and a conductive element electrically insulated from the turns and crossing over or under at least one turn of the at least two turns in a layout in which no turns of the antenna are disposed between the two ends.

These amended claims are fully supported by this application's disclosure. For example, as illustrated in the figures, no turns of the antenna 11 are disposed between the pair of connection pads 12.

By contrast, as clearly seen, for example in Fidalgo's Figs. 1 and 2, the turns of the antenna 5 are disposed between the contact terminals 15. Thus, Fidalgo does not disclose any of the methods recited in independent Claims 47, 52, 54, 55 or 56. Moreover, Gaumet does not cure this deficiency in Fidalgo.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 47, 52, 54, 55 or 56 are each clearly allowable over the disclosures in Fidalgo and Gaumet. Withdrawal of the prior art rejections of those claims is therefore respectfully requested.

The Official Action also sets forth a double patenting rejection of Claims 47-50 and 54-55 based on claims in U.S. Patent No. 7,664,564. Applicants respectfully submit that the above-discussed claim amendments add subject matter not claimed in any of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,664,564. Withdrawal of the double patenting rejections is therefore also respectfully requested.

The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in the dependent claims is not set forth at this time.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful

in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17 and 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: February 7, 2011

By: /Peter T. deVore/
Peter T. deVore
Registration No. 60361

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620